



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,246	05/25/2001	Morton Gregory Swimmer	YOR920010310US1	3963
35526	7590	05/18/2005	EXAMINER	
DUKE. W. YEE YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C. P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS, TX 75380			ZAND, KAMBIZ	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2132	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,246

Applicant(s)

SWIMMER ET AL.

Examiner

Kambiz Zand

Art Unit

2132

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 February 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05/21/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Kambiz Zand
Au 2132

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this section can be found in the prior office action.
2. The prior office actions are incorporated herein by reference. In particular, the observations with respect to claim language, and response to previously presented arguments.
3. Claims 1, 10, 24, 26, 35, 47 and 56 have been amended.
4. Claims 1-67 are pending.
5. Examiner withdraws rejection of claims 1-67 under 35 U.S.C 112-second paragraphs due to correction by the applicant.
6. Examiner request clarification with respect to fig.6. it discloses also notations for fig.6a-e and fig.1. corrections or clarification are requested.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-12, 22-24, 26-37, 45 and 47-58 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) in view of Cozza (5,473,769 A).

As per claims 1, 22, 24, 26 and 47 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach a system and a computer program product in a computer readable medium and a method in a data processing system for protecting data from damage, the system, the computer program product and the method comprising:

Jurnaling the data to from journaled data, wherein journaling the data comprises determining whether a virus is present in the data processing system after journaling of the data has began, including comparison and pattern matching (see abstract; fig.6 and associated text) but do not disclose restoring the data using the journaled data, maintaining a previous state of the data for subsequent, optional restore of the data to the previous state. However Cozza (5,473,769 A) disclose restoring the data using the journaled data, maintaining a previous state of the data for subsequent, optional restore of the data to the previous state (see col.2, lines 49-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Cozza's restoration capability in Conklin's virus monitoring and detection method and system in order to eliminate the necessity of scanning all portions of files and volumes for all viruses (see col.2, lines 42-45).

Art Unit: 2132

As per claims 2, 27 and 48 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47 further comprising: responsive to an absence of an identification of the virus, discarding the journaled data (see fig.6 and 7 and associated text with respect to discard).

As per claims 3, 28 and 49 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, wherein the determining step comprises: performing pattern matching (see fig.7 and associated text).

As per claims 4, 29 and 50 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 3, 28 and 49, wherein the performing step includes: comparing a set of actions occurring within the data processing system with a set of patterns (see fig.7 and associated text).

As per claims 5, 30 and 51 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, wherein the data is located in a storage device external to the data processing system (see fig.3, 4 and associated text where the storage within the hosts are external to monitoring system).

Art Unit: 2132

As per claims 6, 31 and 52 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, further comprising: recording a sequence of actions occurring within the data processing system (see fig.4, evidence log; fig.8 and associated text).

As per claims 7, 32 and 53 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, wherein the data is data accessed by a process within the data processing system (see fig.4-5 and associated text).

As per claims 8, 33 and 54 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47 further comprising: responsive to an identification of the virus, blocking access to the data by a process accessing the data (see col.5, lines 34-38).

As per claims 9, 34 and 55 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47 further comprising: responsive to an identification of the virus, generating an indication halting a process accessing the data (see col.5, lines 24-44).

Art Unit: 2132

As per claims 10, 35 and 56 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, wherein the data journaled is data accessed by a single process and maintained until a determination is made that the single process is eliminated as a virus candidate (see fig.6 and associated text).

As per claims 11, 36 and 57 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 1, 26 and 47, wherein the journaled data is stored in a protected memory accessible only by the method (see fig.9 and associated text).

As per claims 12, 37 and 58 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 11, 37 and 57, wherein the journaled data is stored in a data structure located in a protected memory inaccessible by a process (see fig.5 and associated text).

As per claim 23 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach all limitation of the claims but do not disclose, wherein the intrusion protection system is located within an operating system. However it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art that operating system is just another program type and such instructions within a program as applied above is also could be implemented within an operating system as another part of the program.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. Claims 13-21, 25, 38-44, 46 and 59-67 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Conklin et al (5,991,881 A).

As per claims 13, 25, 38 and 59 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach a system and a computer program product in a computer readable medium and a method, the system, the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method comprising: saving a state of a data object in response to a request to access the data object by a process; performing pattern matching of a set of actions taken within the data processing system; and determining whether an unauthorized intrusion has occurred in response to performing pattern matching (see fig.6-9 and associated text where base on request , detection, pattern matching are taken to determine an attack or intrusion).

As per claims 14, 39 and 60 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 13, 38 and 59, wherein the performing step comprises: comparing the set of actions to a pattern from a set of patterns to form a comparison; determining whether the comparison indicates that the unauthorized intrusion has occurred; and responsive to an absence of the unauthorized intrusion, repeating the comparing step using another pattern from the set of patterns (see

fig.6-9 and associated text).

As per claims 15, 40 and 61 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 13, 38 and 59, wherein the performing step comprises: matching patterns with the set of actions; determining whether the unauthorized intrusion has occurred; if an intrusion is absent, determining whether a time threshold has been reached; and if an absence of a reaching of the time threshold is present, repeating the matching step using another set of actions (see fig.6-8 and associated text; col.6, lines 60-63).

As per claims 16, 41 and 62 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 14, 39 and 60, wherein match between the pattern and the set of actions identifies an absence of the unauthorized intrusion (see fig.6, discard).

As per claims 17, 42 and 63 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 14, 39 and 60, wherein match between the pattern and the set of actions identifies a presence of the unauthorized intrusion (see fig.6-9).

As per claims 18, 43 and 64 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method

Art Unit: 2132

of claims 13, 38 and 59, wherein the intrusion is caused by a virus (see abstract; fig.6).

As per claims 19, 44 and 65 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 13, 38 and 59, wherein the intrusion is caused by an authorized user input (see col.6, lines 47-55 where all addresses of the intrusion are recorded, Examiner considers the addresses includes both authorized or non authorized).

As per claims 20, 45 and 66 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 13, 38 and 59 further comprising: saving a state of all data objects within the data processing system (see fig.8 with respect to logs and associated text).

As per claims 21, 46 and 67 Conklin et al (5,991,881 A) teach the system and the computer program product in a computer readable medium and the method of claims 13, 38, and 59, wherein the data is located in a storage device external to the data processing system (see fig.3, 4 and associated text where the storage within the hosts are external to monitoring system).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2132

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kambiz Zand whose telephone number is (571) 272-3811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday (8:00-5:00). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on (571) 272-3799. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kambiz Zand

05/13/2005

AU 2132